09/777,261.

C of C

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Anderson et al.	Attorney Docket No.: SUN1P807/P5231
Patent: 6,961,939 B2	Issued: November 1, 2005

Title: TECHNIQUES FOR TRANSMISSION OF
MESSAGE FRAGMENTS BETWEEN OBJECT
REQUEST BROKERS

REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATE OF CORRECTION
OF OFFICE MISTAKE
(35 U.S.C. §254, 37 CFR §1.322)

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Attn: Certificate of Correction

Certificate

MAR 2 4 2006

of Correction

Dear Sir:

Attached is Form PTO-1050 (Certificate of Correction) at least one copy of which is suitable for printing. The errors together with the exact page and line number where the errors are shown correctly in the application file are as follows:

SPECIFICATION:

1.   Column 2, line 24, add --14-- after "implementation". This appears correctly in the patent application as filed on February 5, 2001, on page 4, line 1.

2   Column 2, line 44, add --50-- after "Object Request Broker". This appears correctly in the patent application as filed on February 5, 2001, on page 4, line 15.

MAR 2 7 2006

Patentee hereby requests expedited issuance of the Certificate of Correction because the error lies with the Office and because the error is clearly disclosed in the records of the Office. As required for expedited issuance, enclosed is documentation that unequivocally supports the patentee's assertion without needing reference to the patent file wrapper.

It is noted that the above-identified errors were printing errors that apparently occurred during the printing process. Accordingly, it is believed that no fees are due in connection with the filing of this Request for Certificate of Correction. However, if it is determined that any fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 500388 (Order No. SUN1P807).

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Fredrik Mollborn
Registration No. 48,587

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
650-961-8300

MAR 27 2006

Fig. 1A illustrates a request 10 being sent by a client 12 to an object implementation 14 through an Object Request Broker 16. The client can be defined as an entity that wishes to perform an operation on an object. The object implementation can be defined as the code and data that actually implements the object. The Object Request Broker is responsible for all the

5 mechanisms required to find the object implementation for the request, to prepare the object implementation to receive the request, and to communicate the data making up the request. The interface the client sees is completely independent of where the object is located, what programming language it is implemented in, or any other aspect that is not reflected in the object interface. More details about the Object Request Broker can be found in the "Common

10 Object Request Broker: Architecture and Specification: CORBA 2.4.1", November, 2000, which is hereby incorporated herein by reference.

As described in the Common Object Request Broker Architecture and Specification, General Inter-ORB protocol (GIOP) specifies formats for messages that are exchanged between inter-operating ORBs. Fig. 1B illustrates a first and second Object Request Broker

15 50 and 52 exchanging messages. For example, the first Object Request Broker 50 can operate in client 54 and send messages to and receive messages from the second Object Request Broker 52 operating in a server 56. As is known those skilled in the art, in some situations, it is desirable to fragment messages that are exchanged between inter-operating ORBs. In other words, there is a need to fragment a message (original message) into two or more sub-

20 messages. The original message typically includes a header and data. The corresponding fragments can also include headers and data portions which collectively represent the data in the original message.

It is often necessary to know the corresponding position of a given data byte in one of the sub-messages with respect to its position in the original message. One reason why this

25 may be necessary is that there may be a reference to data in the original message rather than another copy of data. Since it may be necessary to know the location of a data byte with respect to its location in the original message, some conventional techniques wait until all the fragments have been constructed before any of the data fragments are transferred. However, this approach is grossly inefficient and may cause delays in data transmission between ORBs.

30 To avoid such pitfalls, some recent techniques have been developed to allow for more efficient transmission of messages. However, these techniques put certain constraints on the transmission of data fragments. For example, the fragment header and/or fragment data sizes need to be of the same size for these techniques to work properly. In addition to the

(Also Form PT-1050)

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
CERTIFICATE OF CORRECTION

PATENT NO. : 6,961,939 B2

DATED : November 1, 2005

INVENTOR(S) : Anderson et al.

It is certified that error appears in the above-identified patent and that said Letters Patent are hereby corrected as shown below:

In the Specifications:

Column 2, line 24, add --14-- after "implementation".

Column 2, line 44, add --50-- after "Object Request Broker".

MAILING ADDRESS OF SENDER:

Fredrik Mollborn
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP
P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250

PATENT NO. 6,961,939 B2

No. of Additional Copies

1

MAR 2 7 2006